UNSW AUSTRALIA

COMP9242
Advanced Operating Systems

S2/2014 Week 7:
Microkernel Design

Copyright Notice

Microkernel Principles: Minimality

A concept is tolerated inside the microkernel only if moving it outside the kernel, i.e. permitting competing implementations, would prevent the implementation of the system's required functionality. [SOSP'95]

- Advantages of resulting small kernel:
  - Easy to implement, port?
  - Easier to optimise
  - Hopefully enables a minimal *trusted computing base* (TCB)
  - Easier debug, maybe even *prove* correct?
- Challenges:
  - API design: generality despite small code base
  - Kernel design and implementation for high performance

Limited by arch-specific micro-optimisations

Small attack surface, fewer failure modes

Consequence of Minimality: User-level Services



IPC performance is critical!

- Kernel provides no services, only mechanisms
- Kernel is policy-free
  - Policies limit (good for 90% of cases, disastrous for some)
  - "General" policies lead to bloat, inefficiency

1993 “Microkernel” IPC Performance



Culprit: Cache footprint [SOSP’95]

i486 @ 50 MHz

L4 IPC Performance over 20 Years

Name	Year	Processor	MHz	Cycles	µs
Original	1993	i486	50	250	5.00
Original	1997	Pentium	160	121	0.75
L4/MIPS	1997	R4700	100	86	0.86
L4/Alpha	1997	21064	433	45	0.10
Hazelnut	2002	Pentium 4	1,400	2,000	1.38
Pistachio	2005	Itanium	1,500	36	0.02
OKL4	2007	XScale 255	400	151	0.64
NOVA	2010	i7 Bloomfield (32-bit)	2,660	288	0.11
seL4	2013	i7 Haswell (32-bit)	3,400	301	0.09
seL4	2013	ARM11	532	188	0.35
seL4	2013	Cortex A9	1,000	316	0.32

Minimality: Source Code Size

Name	Architecture	C/C++	asm	total kSLOC
Original	i486	0	6.4	6.4
L4/Alpha	Alpha	0	14.2	14.2
L4/MIPS	MIPS64	6.0	4.5	10.5
Hazelnut	x86	10.0	0.8	10.8
Pistachio	x86	22.4	1.4	23.0
L4-embedded	ARMv5	7.6	1.4	9.0
OKL4 3.0	ARMv6	15.0	0.0	15.0
Fiasco.OC	x86	36.2	1.1	37.6
seL4	ARMv6	9.7	0.5	10.2

L4 Family Tree



L4 Deployments – in the Billions

NICTA

SiMKo 3 “Merkelphone”

UNSW AUSTRALIA

L4 Design and Implementation

Implement. Tricks [SOSP'93]

- Process kernel
- Virtual TCB array
- Lazy scheduling
- Direct process switch
- Non-preemptible
- Non-portable
- Non-standard calling convention
- Assembler

Design Decisions [SOSP'95]

- Synchronous IPC
- Rich message structure, arbitrary out-of-line messages
- Zero-copy register messages
- User-mode page-fault handlers
- Threads as IPC destinations
- IPC timeouts
- Hierarchical IPC control
- User-mode device drivers
- Process hierarchy
- Recursive address-space construction

Objective: Minimise cache footprint and TLB misses

DESIGN

What Mechanisms?

- Fundamentally, the microkernel must abstract
  - *Physical memory*
  - *CPU*
  - *Interrupts/Exceptions*
- Unfettered access to any of these bypasses security
  - No further abstraction needed for devices
    - memory-mapping device registers and interrupt abstraction suffices
    - …but some generalised memory abstraction needed for I/O space
- Above isolates execution units, hence microkernel must also provide
  - *Communication* (traditionally referred to as *IPC*)
  - *Synchronization*

Policy-Free Address-Space Management



- Kernel provides empty address-space "shell"
  - page faults forwarded to server
  - server provides mapping
- Cost:
  - 1 round-trip IPC, plus mapping operation
    - mapping may be side effect of IPC
    - kernel may expose data structure
  - kernel mechanism for forwarding page-fault exception
- "External pagers" first appeared in Mach [Rashid et al, '88]
  - … but were optional (and slow) – in L4 there's no alternative

Abstracting Memory: Address Spaces

- Minimum address-space abstraction: empty slots for page mappings
  - paging server can fill with mappings
    - virtual address → physical address + permissions
- Can be
  - page-table–like: array under full user control
  - TLB-like: cache for mappings which may vanish
- Main design decision: is source of a mapping a page or a frame?
  - Frame: hardware-like
  - Page: recursive address spaces (original L4 model)

Traditional L4: Recursive Address Spaces



Recursive Address Space Experience

API complexity: Recursive address-space model

- Conceptually elegant
  - trivially supports virtualization
- Drawback: Complex mapping database
  - Kernel needs to track mapping relationship
    - Tear down dependent mappings on unmap
  - Mapping database problems:
    - accounts for 1/4–1/2 of kernel memory use
    - SMP coherence is performance bottleneck
- NICTA's L4-embedded, OKL4 removed MDB
  - Map frames rather than pages
    - need separate abstraction for frames / physical memory
    - subsystems no longer virtualizable (even in OKL4 cap model)
- Properly addressed by seL4's capability-based model
  - But have cap derivation tree, subject of on-going research

Abstracting Execution

- Can abstract as:
  - kernel-scheduled threads
    - Forces (scheduling) policy into the kernel
  - vCPUs or scheduler activations
    - This essentially virtualizes the timer interrupt through upcall
      - Scheduler activations also upcall for exceptions, blocking etc
    - Multiple vCPUs only for real multiprocessing
- Threads can be tied to address space or “migrating”

  - Implementation-wise not much of a difference
- Tight integration/interdependence with IPC model!

Abstracting Interrupts and Exceptions

- Can abstract as:
  - Upcall to interrupt/exception handler
    - hardware-like diversion of execution
    - need to save enough state to continue interrupted execution
  - IPC message to handler from magic “hardware thread”
    - OS-like
    - needs separate handler thread ready to receive





- Page fault tends to be special-cased for practical reason
  - Tends to require handling external to faulter
    - IPC message to page-fault server rather than exception handler
  - But also “self-paging” as in Nemesis [Hand ’99] or Barrelfish

L4 Synchronous IPC



Rendezvous model

Kernel executes in sender's context

- copies memory data directly to receiver (single-copy)
- leaves message registers unchanged during context switch (zero copy)

“Long” IPC



- IPC page faults are nested exceptions ⇒ In-kernel concurrency
  - L4 executes with interrupts disabled for performance, no concurrency
- Must invoke untrusted usermode page-fault handlers
  - potential for DOSing other thread
- Timeouts to avoid DOS attacks
  - complexity

Why have long IPC?
- POSIX-style APIs
  write (fd, buf, nbytes)
- Usually prefer shared buffers

Timeouts



- No theory/heuristics for determining timeouts
- Typically server reply with zero TO, else ∞
- Added complexity
- Can do timed wait with timer syscall

Synchronous IPC Issues





- Sync IPC forces multi-threaded code!
- Also poor choice for multi-core

Asynchronous Notifications



Sync IPC complemented with async

- Delivers few bits (destructively)
- Kernel only buffers single word
- Maps well to interrupts, exceptions

- Thread can wait for synchronous and asynchronous messages concurrently



Is Synchronous IPC Redundant?

2 IPC mechanisms: Minimality violation



Sync IPC is useful *intra-core*:

- fast control transfer
- mimics migrating threads
- enables scheduling context donation
  - ➢ useful for real-time systems

But presently no clean model!

Direct vs Indirect IPC Adressing

- Direct: Queue senders/messages at receiver
  - Need unique thread IDs
  - Kernel guarantees identity of sender
    - useful for authentication



- Indirect: Mailbox/port object
  - Just a user-level handle for the kernel-level queue
  - Extra object type – extra weight?
  - Communication partners are anonymous
    - Need separate mechanism for authentication



IPC Destination Naming



Endpoints





- Sync EP queues senders/receivers
- Does not buffer messages



- Async EP accumulates bits

Other Design Issues

IPC Control: "Clans & Chiefs"



IPC outside clan re-directs to chief

- Inflexible, clumsy, inefficient hierarchies!
- Fundamental problem: no rights delegation

Process Hierarchy

Hierarchical resource management



Hierarchies replaced by delegatable cap-based access control

IMPLEMENTATION

Virtual TCB Array



Trades cache for TLB footprint and virtual address space

Not worthwhile on modern processors!

Process Kernel: Per-Thread Kernel Stack



Scheduler Optimisation Tricks: "Lazy Scheduling"


```
thread_t schedule() {
    foreach (prio in priorities) {
        foreach (thread in runQueue[prio]) {
            if (isRunnable(thread))
                return thread;
            else
                schedDequeue(thread);
            }
        }
    return idleThread;
}
```

Problem: Unbounded scheduler execution time!

Idea: leave blocked threads in ready queue, scheduler cleans up

- Frequent blocking/unblocking in IPC-based systems
- Many ready-queue manipulations



Alternative: “Benno Scheduling”


```
thread_t schedule() {
    foreach (prio in priorities) {
        foreach (thread in runQueue[prio]) {
            if (isRunnable(thread))
                return thread;
            else
                schedDequeue(thread);
        }
    }
    return idleThread;
}
```

Lazy scheduling
REPLACED

Only current thread needs fixing up at preemtion time!

Idea: Lazy on unblocking instead on blocking

- Frequent blocking/unblocking in IPC-based systems
- Many ready-queue manipulations



Scheduler Optimisation: "Direct Process Switch"

- Sender was running ⇒ had highest prio
- If receiver prio ≥ sender prio ⇒ run receiver

Implication: *Time slice donation* – receiver runs on sender's time slice

- Arguably, sender should donate back if it's a server replying to a Call()
- Hence, always donate on Reply_Wait()

Problem:
- Accounting (RT systems)
- Policy
- No clean model yet!

Idea: Don't invoke scheduler if you know who'll be chosen

- Frequent context switches in IPC-based systems
- Many scheduler invocations



Speaking of Real Time…



- Kernel runs with interrupts disabled
  - No concurrency control ⇒ simpler kernel
    - Easier reasoning about correctness
    - Better average-case performance

Limited concurrency in kernel!

```
while (!done) {
  process_stuff();
  PSW.IRQ_disable=1;
  PSW.IRQ_disable=0;
}
```

- How about long-running system calls?
  - Use strategic *premption points*
  - (Original) Fiasco has fully preemptible kernel
    - Like commercial microkernels (QNX, Green Hills INTEGRITY)

Lots of concurrency in kernel!

Incremental Consistency



Example: Destroying IPC Endpoint



Actions:

1. Disable EP cap (prevent new messages)
2. **while** message queue not empty **do**
3. remove head of queue (abort message)
4. check for pending interrupts
5. **done**

Difficult Example: Revoking IPC "Badge"



Synchronous IPC Implementation

185 cycles on ARM11!

NICTA

Simple send (e.g. as part of RPC-like "call"):



UNSW AUSTRALIA

Fastpath Coding Tricks


```
slow =     cap_get_capType(en_c) != cap_endpoint_cap ||
           !cap_endpoint_cap_get_capCanSend(en_c);
if (slow)   enter_slow_path();
```

Common case: 0

Common case: 1

- Reduces branch-prediction footprint
- Avoids mispredicts, stalls & flushes
- Uses ARM instruction predication
- But: increases slow-path latency
  - should be minimal compared to basic slow-path cost

Lazy FPU Switch

- FPU context tends to be heavyweight
  - eg 512 bytes FPU state on x86
- Only few apps use FPU (and those don't do many syscalls)
  - saving and restoring FPU state on every context switch is wastive!



Other implementation tricks

- Cache-friendly data structure layout, especially TCBs
  - data likely used together is on same cache line
  - helps best-case and worst-case performance



- Kernel mappings locked in TLB (using superpages)
  - helps worst-case performance
  - helps establish invariants: page table never walked when in kernel

Other Lessons Learned from 2nd Generation

- Programming languages:
  - original i496 kernel ['95]: all assembler
  - UNSW MIPS and Alpha kernels ['96,'98]: half assembler, half C
  - Fiasco [TUD '98], Pistachio ['02]: C++ with assembler "fast path"
  - seL4 ['09], OKL4 ['09]: all C

C++ ABANDONED

- Lessons:
  - C++ sux: code bloat, no real benefit
  - Changing calling conventions not worthwhile
    - Conversion cost in library stubs and when entering C in kernel
    - Reduced compiler optimisation
  - Assembler unnecessary for performance
    - Can write C so compiler will produce near-optimal code
    - C entry from assembler cheap if calling conventions maintained
    - seL4 performance with C-only pastpath as good as other L4 kernels [Blackham & Heiser '12]

Assembler coding ABANDONED

L4 Design and Implementation

Implement. Tricks [SOSP'93]

- ~~Process kernel~~
- ~~Virtual TCB array~~
- ~~Lazy scheduling~~
- Direct process switch
- Non-preemptible
- ~~Non-portable~~
- ~~Non-standard calling convention~~
- ~~Assembler~~

Design Decisions [SOSP'95]

- Synchronous IPC
- Rich message structure, ~~arbitrary out-of-line~~ messages
- Zero-copy register messages
- User-mode page-fault handlers
- ~~Threads as IPC~~ destinations
- ~~IPC timeouts~~
- ~~Hierarchical IPC~~ control
- User-mode device drivers
- ~~Process hierarchy~~
- ~~Recursive address-space construction~~

seL4 Design Principles

- Fully delegatable access control
- All resource management is subject to user-defined policies
  - Applies to kernel resources too!
- Suitable for *formal verification*
  - Requires small size, avoid complex constructs
- Performance on par with best-performing L4 kernels
  - Prerequisite for real-world deployment!
- Suitability for real-time use
  - Only partially achieved to date ☹
    - on-going work…

(Informal) Requirements for Formal Verification

- Verification scales poorly ⇒ small size (LOC and API)
- Conceptual complexity hurts ⇒ KISS
- Global invariants are expensive ⇒ KISS
- Concurrency difficult to reason about ⇒ single-threaded kernel

Largely in line with traditional L4 approach!

seL4 Fundamental Abstractions

- Capabilities as opaque names and access tokens
  - All kernel operations are cap invokations (except `Yield()`)
- IPC:
  - Synchonous (blocking) message passing plus asynchous notification
  - Endpoint objects implemented as message queues
    - Send: get receiver TCB from endpoint or enqueue self
    - Receive: obtain sender's TCB from endpoint or enqueue self
- Other APIs:
  - `Send()/Receive()` to/from virtual kernel endpoint
  - Can interpose operations by substituting actual endpoint
- Fully user-controlled memory management

Remember: seL4 User-Level Memory Management



Remaining Conceptual Issues in seL4

IPC & Tread Model:

- Is the “mostly synchronous + a bit of async” model appropriate?
  - forces kernel scheduling of user activities
  - forces multi-threaded userland

Time management:

- Present scheduling model is ad-hoc and insufficient
  - fixed-prio round-robin forces policy
  - not sufficient for some classes of real-time systems (time triggered)
  - no real support for hierarchical real-time scheduling
  - lack of an elegant resource management model for time



Lessons From 20 Years of L4

- Minimality is excellent driver of design decisions
  - L4 kernels have become simpler over time
  - Policy-mechanism separation (user-mode page-fault handlers)
  - Device drivers really belong to user level
  - Minimality is key enabler for formal verification!
- IPC speed still matters
  - But not everywhere, premature optimisation is wasteful
  - Compilers have got so much better
  - Verification does not compromise performance
  - Verification invariants can help improve speed! [Shi, OOPSLA'13]
- Capabilities are the way to go

• Details changed, but principles remained
• Microkernels rock! (If done right!)

